



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,810	02/05/2004	Rafay Khan	N0187US	5973
37583	7590	06/23/2010	EXAMINER	
NAVTEQ NORTH AMERICA, LLC 425 West RANDOLPH STREET SUITE 1200, PATENT DEPT CHICAGO, IL 60606			QUIETT, CARRAMAH J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2622		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		06/23/2010		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,810	KHAN, RAFAY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carramah J. Quiett	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 25-27 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 25-27 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/02/2010 has been entered. Claims 25-27 and 31-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-27 and 31-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. **Claims 25, 27, and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abram et al. (US Pat. #6432778) in view of Abramson (US Pub. #2005/0268254).

For **claim 25**, Abram teaches a computer-readable recording medium encoded with a computer program that performs a method, the method comprising:

obtaining data from a camera removably connected to a computer platform the obtained data indicating geographic coordinates associated with each of a plurality of pictures taken by the camera (col. 3, lines 39-67; col. 6, lines 16-56);

requesting from a remotely located map service server (GPS) a municipality name corresponding to the geographic coordinates associated with each of the plurality of pictures (col. 6, lines 16-56); the remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates (col. 6, lines 16-56); and if the geographic coordinates associated with at least one of the plurality of pictures are determined to be coordinates from which the landmark is observable based on the data included in the remotely located map service server, receiving data indicating a name of the landmark (col. 6, lines 16-56). Also see figs. 3 and 9.

However, Abram does not expressly teach the remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable *by a person* from specific geographic coordinates; and if the geographic coordinates associated with at least one of the plurality of pictures are determined to be coordinates from which the landmark is observable via a person's view based on the data included in the remotely located map service server, receiving data indicating a name of the landmark.

In a similar field of endeavor, Abramson the remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable *by a person* from specific geographic coordinates; and if the geographic coordinates associated with at least one of the plurality of pictures are determined to be coordinates from which the landmark is observable via a person's view based on the data included in the remotely located map service server, receiving data indicating a name of the landmark. Please see figs. 3-9 and read page 10, paragraphs [0088]-[0093]. In light of the teaching of Abramson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Abram with the method of

Abramson in order to provide the convenience of obtaining information about a neighborhood, city, or community, etc. (Abramson, page 1, paragraph [0007]).

For **claim 27**, Abram, as modified by, Abramson teaches the method of Claim 25 wherein the camera is removably connected to the computer platform with a wireless connection (col. 3, lines 39-67).

Claim 31 is a computer-readable recording medium encoded with a computer program that performs a method claim corresponding to claim 25. However, claim 31 recites, “...requesting from a remotely located map service server a municipality name corresponding to the geographic coordinates *associated with the picture...*” Claim 31 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 25.

5. **Claims 26, 32, and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abram et al. (US Pat. #6432778) in view of Abramson (US Pub. #2005/0268254) as applied to claims 25 and 31 above, and further in view of Pelletier (US Pat. #6,690,883).

For **claim 26**, Abram, as modified by, Abramson teaches the method of Claim 25 wherein the camera is removably connected to the computer platform (col. 3, lines 39-67). However Abram does not expressly teach a method wherein the camera is removably connected to the computer platform with a USB cable.

In a similar field of endeavor, Pelletier teaches a method wherein the camera is removably connected to the computer platform with a USB cable (col. 3, lines 35-48; col. 4, lines 35-56). . In light of the teaching of Pelletier, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Abram with the USB cable

as recited in claim 26 in order to provide a method with alternative network/communication connections (Pelletier, col. 3, lines 35-48).

For **claim 32**, Abram, as modified by, Abramson teaches the method of Claim 31. However Abram does not expressly teach the method further comprising: adding the name of the landmark to the picture.

In a similar field of endeavor, Pelletier teaches a method further comprising: adding the name of the landmark to the picture (col. 7, lines 48-54; col. 8, lines 42-62; col. 9, lines 7-11). . In light of the teaching of Pelletier, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Abram with the adding the name of the landmark as recited in claim 32 in order allow the user to optimize the self annotating techniques as taught in Pelletier (col. 3, line 18 - col. 4, line 56).

For **claim 33**, Abram, as modified by, Abramson teaches the method of Claim 31 adding the municipality name to the picture (col. 6, lines 37-56). However Abram does not expressly teach the method further comprising: adding the name of the landmark and the municipality name to the picture.

In a similar field of endeavor, Pelletier teaches a method further comprising: adding the name of the landmark and the municipality name to the picture (col. 3, line 18 - col. 4, line 56; col. 7, lines 48-54; col. 8, lines 42-62; col. 9, lines 7-11). In light of the teaching of Pelletier, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Abram with the adding the name of the landmark and the municipality name as recited in claim 33 in order allow the user to optimize the self annotating techniques as taught in Pelletier (col. 1, lines 39-63; col. 3, line 18 - col. 4, line 56).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carramah J. Quiett whose telephone number is (571)272-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:00 pm, Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David L. Ometz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2622

/C. J. Q./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622
June 19, 2010